# **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

# **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

United States of America

## ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

V.

		Pedro I	Montes Ortiz	Case Number:	18-00089MJ
				42(f), a detention hearing has been oth, as applicable.)	n submitted to the Court. I conclude
	-		onvincing evidence the defendant n this case.	t is a danger to the community and	d require the detention of the defendant
	, ,	•	erance of the evidence the defend on this case.	ant is a serious flight risk and requ	uire the detention of the defendant
			PART	I FINDINGS OF FACT	
	(1)		• ( / ( / ( /	ant has been convicted of a (feder circumstance giving rise to federal	ral offense)(state or local offense that jurisdiction had existed) that is
			a crime of violence as defined i	n 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4).	
			an offense for which the maxim	ium sentence is life imprisonment	or death.
			an offense for which a maximul	m term of imprisonment of ten yea	rs or more is prescribed in
			a felony that was committed aft described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(	er the defendant had been convictif)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state of	ted of two or more prior federal offenses or local offenses.
				ned in section 921), or any other o	ssion or use of a firearm or destructive dangerous weapon, or involves a failure
	(2)	18 U.S.C. §3142(e)(2)(B): The offense described in finding 1 was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense.			
	(3)			not more than five years has elaps m imprisonment) for the offense d	
	(4)	will rea	gs Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish asonably assure the safety of (an butted this presumption.	a rebuttable presumption that no on the community of the	condition or combination of conditions ty. I further find that the defendant has
			Α	Iternative Findings	
	(1)	18 U.S	S.C. 3142(e)(3): There is probabl	e cause to believe that the defend	ant has committed an offense
			for which a maximum term of in	nprisonment of ten years or more	is prescribed in1
			under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c), 956(	a), or 2332b.	
			under 18 U.S.C. 1581-1594, for prescribed.	r which a maximum term of imprise	onment of 20 years or more is
			an offense involving a minor vio	ctim under section	2
	(2)	The de	efendant has not rebutted the pre	sumption established by finding 1	that no condition or combination of uired and the safety of the community.

 $<sup>^{1}</sup> Insert \ as \ applicable: (a) \ Controlled \ Substances \ Act \ (21 \ U.S.C. \ \S \ 801 \ et \ seq.); (b) \ Controlled \ Substances \ Import \ and \ Export \ Act \ (21 \ U.S.C. \ \S \ 951 \ et \ seq.); or \ (c) \ Section \ 1 \ of \ Act \ of \ Sept. \ 15, \ 1980 \ (21 \ U.S.C. \ \S \ 955a).$ 

 $<sup>{}^{2}\</sup>text{Insert as applicable } 18\,\text{U.S.C.}\,\$\$1201,1591,2241-42,2244(a)(1),2245,2251,2251A,2252(a)(1),2252(a)(2),2252(a)(3,2252(a)(4),2260,2421,2422,2423,\text{ or }2425.$ 

	Alternative Findings				
(1)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will flee; no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required.				
(2)	No condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of others and the community.				
(3)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will (obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice) (threaten, injure, or intimidate a prospective witness or juror).				
(4)					
	PART II WRITTEN STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DETENTION (Check one or both, as applicable.)				
(1)	I find that the credible testimony and information <sup>3</sup> submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence as to danger that:				
(2)	I find that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:				
$\boxtimes$	The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.				
	The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.				
	calculated to assure his/her future appearance.				
	The defendant has a prior criminal history.				
⊠ □					
	The defendant has a prior criminal history.				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The rules concerning admissibility of evidence in criminal trials do not apply to the presentation and consideration of information at the [detention] hearing. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f). See 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) for the factors to be taken into account.

### In addition:

The defendant submitted the issue of detention. The defendant has ties to a foreign country. There is no evidence of defendant having community ties in the District of Arizona or elsewhere within the United States. The weight of the evidence against the defendant is great.

The Court incorporates by reference the findings of the Pretrial Services Agency which were reviewed by the Court at the time of the hearing in this matter.

### PART III -- DIRECTIONS REGARDING DETENTION

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his/her designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

### PART IV -- APPEALS AND THIRD PARTY RELEASE

IT IS ORDERED that should an appeal of this detention order be filed with the District Court, it is counsel's responsibility to deliver a copy of the motion for review/reconsideration to Pretrial Services at least one day prior to the hearing set before the District Court. Pursuant to Rule 59(a), FED.R.CRIM.P., effective December 1, 2009, Defendant shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of service of a copy of this order or after the oral order is stated on the record within which to file specific written objections with the district court. Failure to timely file objections in accordance with Rule 59(a) may waive the right to review. 59(a), FED.R.CRIM.P.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if a release to a third party is to be considered, it is counsel's responsibility to notify Pretrial Services sufficiently in advance of the hearing before the District Court to allow Pretrial Services an opportunity to interview and investigate the potential third party custodian.

DATED this 5th day of February, 2018

Michelle H. Burns
United States Magistrate Judge